



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,459	09/13/2000	Morikatsu Matsuda	000004.000661	2151

27557 7590 10/04/2004

BLANK ROME LLP
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

GOODMAN, CHARLES

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/661,459

Applicant(s)

MATSUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Charles Goodman

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed on 4/30/2004 has been entered.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 3724

5. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn in view of Klingel (US 4,583,719).

Dunn discloses the invention substantially as claimed (note the last Office Action), except for the first positioning device further including a first approaching motor. However, Klingel teaches a machine for stamping, nibbling, etc. comprising a positioning device (e.g. 34, 44) having a drive motor (11) for positioning the workpiece in the X-direction and further including an approaching motor (7) for the purpose of motorize adjustable clamping of workpieces of various widths (see, e.g., Fig. 1) which clearly teach or suggest ease of computer control in facilitating the clamped feeding of the workpieces. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the device of Dunn with the further motor as taught and suggested by Klingel in order to facilitate computerized control of clamping feeding of the workpieces of various widths which inherently minimizes any down time caused by manual adjustment of the same.

6. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn in view of Klingel (US 4,583,719) as applied to claims 14 and 16 above, and further in view of Graf et al.

The modified device of Dunn discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the work piece being a material uncoiled from a coiled material. However, although Dunn, alone or modified, is silent as to the sheet work piece being from coiled material, it is old and well known in the art to utilize the device and method of Dunn for punching sheet material uncoiled from a coiled material as evidenced by Graf et al. Graf et al clearly teaches a punching device and method wherein positioning devices (80,

Art Unit: 3724

105) are used to clamp and feed sheet shaped material uncoiled from a coiled material to a punching station (1 - see Fig. 1) for the inherent advantage of machine processing economy, i.e. less down time caused by intermittent feeding of discontinuous work piece sheets, that a longer continuous work piece material affords. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device and method of Dunn with the coiled material as taught by Graf et al for the reasons stated *supra*.

Alternatively, the coiled material has not been given significant patentable weight, since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). Moreover, with respect to the apparatus claims, the claimed "coiled material" fails to further limit the structure of the invention to the extent necessary for any significant patentable consideration since the work piece itself does not define any *structure*. The claims also lack any specific structural detail that is distinctive for the "coiled material." Thus, for all the foregoing reasons, it is not subject to significant patentable weight.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-14 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724


Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Goodman whose telephone number is (703) 308-0501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached on (703) 308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

cg
September 28, 2004


Charles Goodman
Primary Examiner
AU 3724

CHARLES GOODMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER